Interpellation.

(*d*) If the present Rules do not admit of remissions being granted for complete loss by excessive floods, will the Government be pleased to extend the scope of the Remission Rules and grant such remissions where they are satisfied that there has been *total* failure of crops on account of excessive floods of extraordinary nature?

(*e*) Will the Government be pleased to state whether any representations were made to them or to the Revenue Department by the ryots of Chenkal pakuthi, Neyyattinkara taluk, for the remission of tax for the Kanni crop of 1096, on account of total failure of crops caused by the destructive action of extraordinary floods, and, if so, what action, if any, has been taken thereon by Government or the Department concerned?

(*f*) Will the Government be pleased to institute a special inquiry into the grievances of the ryots of Chenkal pakuthi and grant them remission for the Kanni crop of 1096, and carry out any works that may be required to mitigate the effect of the floods on the wet lands?

9. Will the Government be pleased to appoint a Committee to inquire into and report upon the necessity for establishing a State Bank in Travancore, with a view to expanding the existing indigenous banking facilities, to consolidate and make secure the transactions of the various banks in the State and to provide adequate capital for the industrial and agricultural development of the State?

Mr. M. Subrahmanya Pillai.

10. (i) The Government, in reply to my question No. III asked in the Council meeting held on the 27th July 1920, have stated that tank-beds to the extent of 90 acres and 40 cents have been registered in favour of individuals since the completion of the Kodayar Project. Will they now be pleased to state whether it includes the Mankulam tank-bed in the Eesantinmangalam pakuthi, Tovala taluk?

(ii) Will the Government be pleased to state whether Mr. N. Raman Pillai B. A., retired Dewan Peishkar and the present owner, had, while in office, any hand in fixing the *tharam* of this tank-bed for the purpose of the assessment of tax, and whether the Government have shown him any concession in fixing the price, and, if so, what that price per acre was?

(iii) Are the Government aware that Mr. N. Ramaswami Pillai of Bhoothapandi, while in active service, had put in an application to the Government, dated Bagdad, 12th

Answer.

(*d*) The existing rule does not contemplate the grant of remission for loss of crop on account of excessive floods in individual fields, but in practice Government have been granting such remissions for widespread loss of crops due to excessive floods.

(*e*) A petition dated the 8th Karkadakam 1095, was received by Government from Trivikraman Velayudhan and others of Chenkal pakuthi, Neyyattinkara taluk, praying for the remission of the tax for the Kanni crop of 1096, on about 205 paras of wet lands in the pakuthi, on account of loss of the crop due to excess of rain, and it was forwarded for disposal to the Dewan Peishkar, Trivandrum, on the 12th Kanni 1096. Five applications for remission in the same connection were also received by the Tahsildar and they were rejected as remission could not be granted under the Remission Rules.

(*f*) The Government see no reason for instituting a special inquiry, the Peishkar being competent to move the Government for grant of remission if there is justification for it. In regard to the protective works referred to, if specific representations are made, they will receive consideration.

Financial Secretary Mr. K. George.

9. The question of deputing an officer to study and report on the working of the State banks in Mysore and Baroda is under the consideration of Government.

Chief Secretary Mr. N. Rajaram Rao.

10. (i) Yes.

(ii) No. The *tharam* was fixed by Government. The price was fixed by the Dewan at Rs. 250 per acre after personal inspection of the land.

(iii) Two applications were received from Mr. Ramaswami Pillai referred to and they were forwarded to the Dewan Peishkar,

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Interpellation.	Answer.
April 1918, through his Commanding Officer, Lieut. Col. Kitson of the 79th Carnatic Infantry, and a subsequent one in the month of January 1919, for the registry in his name of a portion of this tank-bed and, if so, will they be pleased to state how they have disposed of the said applications?	Padmanabhapuram, for disposal. These related to ten acres of this tank-bed land.
(iv) Did the Government receive other applications for the registry of the said tank-bed; and, if so, how many were received, what were the prices offered, and how were those applications disposed of?	(iv) No.
(v) If it is on concession rate that this tank-bed was registered in the name of the present owner, will the Government be pleased to state if such treatment has been meted out to any other person in the matter of the registry of tank-beds within the commanded area, and how many acres were thus disposed of?	(v) No concession in the matter of *tharavila* appears to have been shown in any case of registry of tank beds.
(vi) Are the Government aware of their orders Nos. P. W. 2845, dated 6th April 1908 and 7203/L. R. & F., dated 12th July 1913, and also their letter No. 2387/L. R., dated 30th March 1915, clearly directing that the tank-beds, rendered unnecessary through the completion of the Kodayar Project, should be sold in public auction, that the sale-proceeds should go to the head of capital and reduce *pro tanto* the capital outlay on the project, and that the yearly direct receipts in the form of water cess and the new taxes on the Government lands within the commanded area, sold and converted into wet lands, should all go towards calculating the net return from the project? If so, will they be pleased to explain their action in disposing of some of the tank-beds otherwise than by public auction and thus not realising their maximum value?	(vi) The Government are aware of the orders referred to. Where Government have deviated from the policy laid down in those orders, the deviation has been made for reasons considered adequate by them.
11. (i) Are the Government aware—	*Secretary Mr. K. Narayanan Pandalay.*
(*a*) that a Bill called "the Nanjinad Vellala Bill" was introduced by the Government in the Legislative Council in the year 1090;	11. (i) (*a*) to (*d*). Yes.
(*b*) that after passing the Select Committee stage it was withdrawn with a view to re-introduce it with its scope enlarged; and	
(*c*) that since its withdrawal in 1092, several petitions and memorials have been submitted to the Government by the members of the Nanjinad Vellala community?	
(*d*) Are the Government aware of the representations made in the 15th and 16th Sessions of the Sri Mulam Popular Assembly by Messrs. M. Thandavamoorti Pillai and A. Thanumalaya Perumal Pillai, elected members of the Tovala taluk, and the Dewan's reply thereto?	
(ii) Will the Government be pleased to state the cause of this long delay in re-introducing the Bill as promised and whether they are in a position to re-introduce the Bill without further delay?	(ii) The delay is due to the difficulty experienced by the Government in correctly gauging the feelings of the community in the matter. To meet this difficulty the Government propose to appoint a Committee to make the necessary enquiry and re-draft the Bill.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly